

NOTE: Next meeting will be April 10, 2002, since most of the group will be in the Value Engineering Session on April 3.

INEEL WATER INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, March 20, 2002

Attendees:

Name	Organization	E-Mail Address
Dave Bates	Northwind Environmental	dbates@nwindenv.com
Jan Brown	INEEL	browjm@inel.gov
Rachel Collins	DOE-ID	collinrl@id.doe.gov
Dave Fredericks	INEEL Oversight Program	dfrederi@deq.state.id.us
Betsy Jonker	DOE-ID	jonkerbs@id.doe.gov
Kendall Kincaid	DOE-ID	kinkaikl@id.doe.gov
Marilynne Manguba	INEEL	mangma@inel.gov
Enoch Miles	DOE-ID	milesew@id.doe.gov
Patti Natoni	DOE-ID	natonipm@id.doe.gov
John Tanner	Coalition 21	pust@srv.net
Buck West	INEEL	westwh@inel.gov
Paul Wichlacz	INEEL	plw@inel.gov
Al Yonk	INEEL	yonkak@inel.gov

On Phone:

Beatrice Brailsford	Snake River Alliance	srabb@earthlink.net
Doug Maddox	DOE-HQ	Doug.Maddox@em.doe.gov
E.B. Nuckols	DOE-HQ	ernest.nuckols@em.doe.gov
Brennon Orr	USGS	brorr@usgs.gov
Joe Rousseau	USGS	jprousse@usgs.gov
Bob Stump	DOE-ID	stumprc@id.doe.gov

Stakeholder Involvement

Jan Brown reported on the joint Wood River and Mid-Snake RC&D meeting on March 26 in Jerome. There were 25 people in attendance, and they rearranged their agenda to spend more time (80 minutes) on the INEEL Water Integration Project. The city and county officials were particularly interested in technologies that might help resolve water quality problems in their communities. The RC&D coordinators felt sufficient interest was demonstrated in the project to continue the dialogue and plan for future meetings with smaller groups. Jan Brown and Doug Burns also had lunch with Kent Just, Executive Director of the Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce, who provided further insight on Twin Falls issues.

Jeff Perry and Jan Brown will be leading a public involvement planning session immediately following the High Country RC&D annual meeting on March 28, in Rexburg. This group will include officials from Clark, Butte, Bonneville, Jefferson and Madison counties in Idaho and Teton County, WY, who will identify issues, information needs and contacts specific to their jurisdiction

Jan showed the draft Events Form, which will be used by project personnel to record interactions (meetings, discussions, etc.). Comments on the form should be sent to Jan Brown.

The results of the phone interviews to elicit a values profile of a variety of stakeholders were presented. Six value areas seemed to dominate: a) Trust in government; b) Effective communication and full disclosure of

information; c) Respect for Idaho's agriculture heritage and its dependence on clean water; d) Cleanup as a priority to protect the environment and public health; e) Credible science and reducing uncertainty; and f) Honesty and integrity. The group reiterated the need for VE Session attendees to agree that the identified values are reflected in their final criteria.

The "How Are We Doing?" suggestion box is up on the Web page and a process to record, respond, and follow up is being developed.

Preparation for VE Session

Al Yonk discussed the preparations for the VE Session. The results of the phone interviews and the "Subsurface Uncertainties and Technology Limitations" summary will be distributed to attendees prior to the meeting. This summary is a result of last Thursday's (3/21) session to review the uncertainties. The detailed information on the uncertainties is in Chapter 4 of "Uncertain Predictions of Contaminant Behavior at INEEL" which is available on the Web page. The first part of the session will focus on developing criteria, which will then be used to prioritize the uncertainties. The draft agenda will be posted to the Web page by Thursday.

Review of Action Tracking Log and 30-day Look Ahead

Items 17, 20, and 21 have been completed.

Jeff Perry reviewed the Action Tracking Log and 30-day Look Ahead as posted to the website.

Al Yonk said after the VE session, the next part of the INEEL VZ Roadmap Development is to fit the prioritized technical uncertainties to the Roadmap and to publish a summary.

Paul Wichlacz clarified the deliverable on the Electronic Library Development. He is working with the INEEL Hydrogeologic Data Repository to identify what they have and what is needed, including appropriate tools for access to the data.

On the Integrated Activity Summary, Marianne Little is looking at the DWPs to identify water-related projects.

Water Resources Committee Meeting (3/26/02)

The Water Resources Committee met on 3/26/02 to discuss conceptual modeling of the INEEL. Almost 40 people were in attendance, including members of the technical community, management, USGS, and NOAA. The WAG 10 conceptual model has been published and USGS will publish their model shortly. The group agreed that there needs to be "one" model. Joe Rousseau asked that a definition of conceptual model be posted to the web (see below). The WR Committee discussed the process to design a model, which will be through a series of workshops between now and September. A summary of existing models and related information will be prepared early in the process. A meeting is scheduled for April 9th to start to hammer out a path forward. E.B. Nuckols suggested that an important part of this process would be to review and become familiar with the WAG 10-08 work plan.

Next Meeting

Wednesday, April 3, 2002 (see note above – it has been decided to cancel this meeting).

Definition:

Conceptual Model - A conceptual model is an evolving hypothesis identifying the important features, processes, and events controlling fluid flow and contaminant transport of consequence at a specific field site in the context of a recognized problem. (From: Conceptual Models of Flow and Transport in the Fractured Vadose Zone, National Academy Press, 2001.)